



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

will be a reference to Codex West, page so-and-so. Of course it is beyond the wildest dream to look for a like consummation in the field of the Latin grammar, the beginners' book, and the literature of "How to Make Latin Interesting"; but if we could arrive at a canon in each of these matters also it might almost be said that our pedagogical decks were cleared for action.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

GRANT SHOWERMAN

Études Syriennes. Par FRANZ CUMONT, Membre de l'Institut.
Paris: Picard, 1917. Pp. xi+379.

This most recent of M. Cumont's works is the result of its author's travels in Northern Syria in the spring of 1907, and of subsequent research. It contains chapters on "Le Marche de l'Empereur Julien," "L'Aigle Funéraire et l'Apothéose," "Les Carrières Romaines d'Énesh," "Le Temple de Zeus Dolichènus," "Trois Mausolées de Commagène," "Cyrrhus," and "Divinités Syriennes," with appendixes giving in admirably ordered detail the author's itinerary, and notes on the inscriptions and Greek manuscripts in Syria employed in his investigation. A hundred illustrations, the greater part from his own photographs, and ten original maps make the text extraordinarily attractive and clear. Illustrations, beautiful typography, and artistic make-up in general have made the volume as great a triumph of the bookmaker as it is of the scholar.

M. Cumont's work would be of surpassing interest to classicists and archaeologists merely as presenting the observations of a scholarly and careful traveler, but it possesses a special value as relating to the art and religion of a region which exercised a considerable influence upon Roman civilization in the West. As was to be expected from one whose works on Mithraism and other eastern cults have made him our greatest authority on the oriental religions in their connection with Rome, the *Études Syriennes* are characterized by broad outlook and comprehensive conclusions. For example, in the chapter on "Trois Mausolées" the Syrian examples are seen to be a link in the long chain beginning with the ordinary earth tumulus, continuing in the pyramid of Egypt, and reaching to Cecilia Metella at Rome and the pretentious tombs of Gaul and Germany, and probably still farther to the ciborium of the church, and even to Mahometan architecture.

M. Cumont has been in exile since the outbreak of the war, pursuing his investigations at Paris and Rome. He is at present residing at 19 Corso d'Italia, Rome.

GRANT SHOWERMAN

Die Attische Tragödie als Bild- und Bühnenkunst. Von EUGEN PETERSEN. Mit zwei Tafeln und einem Textbild. Bonn: Friedrich Cohen, 1915. Pp. 660.

Greek tragedy is a priceless heritage, a "Prüfstein und Mass" for the testing of all subsequent dramatic art. This is strictly true, however, only

if the character of the ancient drama be accorded by self-effacing devotion its full and genuine potency, and be not vitiated by pedantry and idle theorizing, nor distorted in the interests of personal ambition or in conformity with modern tastes. Much mischief has been wrought by the acceptance of the old and widespread notion that ancient tragedy "nicht echte, d. h. objektive Kunst sei, sondern durch und durch subjektiv." Euripides particularly has suffered in this regard. But the doctrine of the *scaenicus philosophus*, though ancient (even Aristophanes himself could not plead innocent), is utterly false, as a thoroughgoing study of the development of tragedy as represented by Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides makes clear.

In this study four aspects of the art of these dramatists are separately investigated: "das Erste [chap. II, S. 64-348] sind die Personen: Götter, Helden, Menschen; das Zweite [chap. III, S. 349-508] die Handlung; das Dritte [chap. IV, S. 509-38] die weitere Umgebung, der nicht selbst dargestellt, vielmehr nur durch Worte vorgestellte Hintergrund, von dem Personen und Handlung sich abheben; das Vierte [chap. V, S. 539-605] die für das Auge des Zuschauers berechnete Darstellung." In each of these elements we find each of the three poets preserving his own characteristics indeed, but "in allen vom ältesten bis zum jüngsten eine stetige Entwicklung, ein wirkliches Stück Kunstgeschichte, durchaus analog nicht nur, sondern innerlichst und notwendig verbunden und einig mit der Geschichte der eigentlichen bildenden Kunst."

For the history of classical drama is "halb Literatur- halb Kunstgeschichte"; there exists between the two a most intimate relationship. In stateliness and repose the Aeschylean drama bears a close resemblance to the pediment groups of the temple of Zeus at Olympia and to the paintings of Polygnotus. And yet, like Polygnotus, "hat gerade Aeschylus diese Ruhe seiner Personen durch eine Menge äusserlicher Zwischenmotive zu beleben versucht: die Anschmiedung des Prometheus, Atossas erstes Auftreten, die Rüstung des Eteokles, . . . das Teppichbreiten und Schuhelösen im Agememnon—bei Polygnot lässt Helena sich die Schuhe binden"! Sophocles' art is akin to that of Phidias, while Euripides (does not tradition state that he had once been a painter?) should be compared with Demetrius, Zeuxis, and Parrhasius, "die monumentale Kunst scheint zu versagen." "Die innere Lebendigkeit, Beweglichkeit, die Sophokles den allzu stabilen Gestalten des Aeschylus gegeben hatte, suchte Euripides noch weiter zu steigern: ihm ward die Beweglichkeit, Reizbarkeit Selbstzweck."

The belief that Euripides was "Bühnenphilosoph" is the product of misguided subjective interpretation. This ancient heresy Valckenaer was the first of modern scholars to revive. In recent years, not to mention Decharme and Nestle, three in particular have flagrantly misrepresented the poet. These are Steiger, whose insistence upon a kinship between Euripides and Ibsen results in a gross caricature, Verrall (apparently the only English writer deserving of more than a passing notice), and von

Wilamowitz-Moellendorf. Verrall's subtleties are the more remarkable as emanating from an Englishman (the English are proverbially matter of fact), and can only be explained as due to German influence. In fact they were begotten in Germany and Wilamowitz was their father, as Verrall himself virtually acknowledges. But all such subtle, subjective interpretations of the poet are wrong. A detailed, unprejudiced study of his art, especially in its relation to the art of Aeschylus and that of Sophocles, shows Euripides to be "der Mann der Bühnenwirkung," "Meister der Bühnenbildkunst," and thus "das Gespenst des Bühnenphilosophen" vanishes into thin air.

An exhaustive criticism of this book cannot be compressed within the limits of a brief review. The author is plainly a reactionary, and many of his conclusions are open to grave question. Of particular interest perhaps is his doctrinaire reconstruction of the *skene*. Even as early as the *Suppliants* of Aeschylus this was provided with a stage. Do not Xenophon, Aristotle, Plutarch, Vitruvius, and Pollux say or imply as much? This stage was about six feet in height and was the regular "Standort" of the actors; the orchestra belonged to the chorus. Actors and chorus frequently appeared on different levels. So in the *Suppliants* of Aeschylus "Danaos ist zwar . . . mit dem Chor . . . gekommen, aber sein Auftreten erfolgt erst nach dem ganzen Einzugslied des Chores, und nicht auf demselben Wege." So in Euripides, "Adrast nicht mit den Müttern, Dionysos nicht mit den Bakchen, Hekabe, auch in den Troerinnen nicht mit diesen auftritt; ebenso in Elektra, Taur. Iph., Helena, und Kyklops Chor und Hauptperson, obwohl eng zusammengehörig, nicht nur getrennt, sondern auch z.T. auf verschiedenen Wegen auftreten, was noch deutlicher werden wird." Play after play is then examined in order to show the use of these upper and lower *parodi*, those at the left ("Heimseite") being indicated respectively by *h* and *H*, those at the right ("Fremdseite") by *f* and *F*. Thus in the *Alcestis* Heracles leaves the stage (l. 860) by the upper *parodos*, *f*; Admetus accompanied by the chorus enters immediately after by the corresponding lower *parodos*, *F*—a neat solution of an old-time crux. How else, pray, could the two be prevented from coming face to face? In the *Electra* of Sophocles, Orestes, Pylades, and their aged attendant enter by *F* and mount the stage, which represents the "Schlossterrasse." At the close of the scene the two young men depart by *f*, the *paedagogus* by *F*. On their return, however, the former as well as the latter enter by *F* and so escape meeting Chrysothemis, who uses the upper *parodos*, *f*. The chorus enters by *H*; Aegisthus, by *h*, "der zum *πρόσκιον* so zu gehören scheint, wie *H* zur Stadt selbst." More than twenty pages are filled with analyses of this sort, which, if accepted, send the labors of Dörpfeld, Reisch, Robert, Capps, Rees, and a host of others reeling to the ropes.

Two "Anhänge" complete the book. The first [S. 606–34] contains elaborate discussions of the two lost plays of Sophocles: the *Andromeda* and the *Thyestes II*; the second [S. 635–57] is devoted to minutiae of textual criticism.

In spite of the undoubted "Gründlichkeit" of its learning the book is one that would have brought a sigh to the lips of Callimachus. Overburdened with tiresome repetitions and prolix analyses it makes dull reading and is a veritable *parvum in multo*. *πολυμαθὴν νόον οὐ διδάσκει*. The second chapter in particular (S. 64-348) suggests a warehouse in which goods without proper labels are piled to the ceiling, or, better, reminds one (there is no index, only a brief "Inhaltsübersicht") of the proverbial haystack.

JAMES TURNER ALLEN

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Le Satire di Orazio. By VINCENZO USSANI. Napoli. F. Perrella, 1916.

The name of Vincenzo Ussani is already familiar to American classical students on the title-page of annotated editions of the *Odes* of Horace and the *Annals* of Tacitus. In the volume before us the same editor presents a similar treatment of the *Satires* of Horace.

The Preface, dealing with "Orazio e la satira," is clear and succinct and does not aim at being exhaustive. Recent American discussions, for instance, are quite untouched. Turning to the satires themselves, we find each one preceded by an intelligent and sympathetic summary; and the fact that our editor does not mince matters is shown by his prominent caption for the second satire: "Meglio la Venere vaga che l'adulterio." The notes, at the bottom of the page, are laudably sane, brief, and direct. The index is limited to proper names.

Inasmuch as any student of Horace who would be using an Italian edition would be quite as competent as the reviewer to make detailed criticisms, I have thought it best simply to indicate the nature of the volume. On the whole, I think it is well adapted to its modest purpose; and it is a pleasure to add that the Italian is throughout delightfully clear.

F. B. R. HELLEMS

Virgil. Eclogues, Georgics, Aeneid i-vi. With an English translation by H. RUSHTON FAIRCLOUGH. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: William Heinemann, 1916. Pp. xiv+671. \$1.50.

Volume I of the Loeb Library Virgil contains the *Eclogues*, the *Georgics*, and the first six books of the *Aeneid*, and is the work of Professor H. Rushton Fairclough, of Stanford University.

A brief introduction of the type now familiar in this series deals clearly and informingly with the "Life of Virgil," "Manuscripts," and "Editions and Commentaries." The translation itself will be thoroughly acceptable to believers in a "literary" version of Virgil. It is often formal and reminiscent of English poetry, but it is never pedantic; and when simplicity and